

<p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> <b>Application No.</b>  10/532,597 </td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> <b>Applicant(s)</b>  PLACHETTA ET AL. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"> <b>Examiner</b>  ALEXANDER C. KOLLIAS </td> <td style="padding: 2px;"> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> <b>Art Unit</b>  1796 </td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/532,597	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PLACHETTA ET AL.	<b>Examiner</b> ALEXANDER C. KOLLIAS	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> <b>Art Unit</b>  1796 </td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	
<b>Application No.</b> 10/532,597	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PLACHETTA ET AL.						
<b>Examiner</b> ALEXANDER C. KOLLIAS	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> <b>Art Unit</b>  1796 </td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796					
<b>Art Unit</b> 1796							

**All Participants:**

(1) ALEXANDER C. KOLLIAS.

(2) Bruton Amernick.

**Date of Interview:** 29 July 2010

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:    ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  
  

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 4-5, 8 10, 13-17, and 19-21

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*see continuation sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

The Examiner contacted Applicant's representative, Mr. Burton Americk, in order to propose an amendment to claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner proposed amending claim 1 in order to connect the process recited in the claim to the pressure differential recited in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner proposed amending the claims as follows:

Claim 1:

- a. blending said product mixture with caprolactam followed by polymerizing the caprolactam to form a masterbatch and filtering the masterbatch in a melt through a filter".
- b. replacing "polymerization product" with masterbatch

claims 19-21:

- c. cancel claim 19 – masterbatch recited in the changes to claim 1
- d. cancel claim 20 – should depend on claim 1 however the subject matter of this claim is already recited in claim 5.
- e. cancel claim 21 – claim 1 already recites water removal before or during polymerization.

Proposed further amendments to the claims:

claim 1 : replace "the confluence" with "a confluence" and "the outer" with "an outer"

claims 2 and 4-5 replace "A process as claimed in claim 1" with "The process of claim 1"

claim 8 replace "includes" with "has":

claim 10 replace "pigments are added" with "pigments is added"

claims 13-17 replace "as claimed in" with "of"

claim 17 – correct typographical error "caprolactum" with "caprolactam"

claim 17 – replace "dispersant" with "dispersing assistant"

Permission for the above changes was given by Mr. Americk of 7/29/2010